

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 35, 39 and 40 have been amended to more particularly define the invention and clearly distinguish over the prior art of record. Claims 1-25, 28, 33 and 41 have been previously cancelled. Currently, claims 26, 27, 29-32 and 34-40 are pending in the application, of which claims 26, 31, 35, 39 are independent. Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification.

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested because it places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. In view of the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Allowed/Allowable Claims

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 26, 27, 29-32 and 34 are allowed and claims 38 and 40 contain allowable subject matter. While Applicant agrees these claims are patentable over the cited references, Applicant does not agree that patentability resides in each feature exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability of each claim.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 35 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,249,011 issued to Matsumoto ("Matsumoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claim 35, the Examiner asserted that, in Matsumoto, the pixel electrode 4 corresponds to the claimed conductive pattern because it is separated from the gate line and covering a gap between the light shielding film 3. This assertion is respectfully disagreed with.

In this response, claim 35 has been amended to recite:

"35. A liquid crystal display (LCD), comprising:
a substrate;
a black matrix formed on the substrate and
disconnected at portions thereof;
a gate line formed on the substrate;
a data line intersecting the gate line;
a pixel electrode formed on the substrate; and
a conductive pattern formed on the substrate,
separated from the gate line and covering a gap between the
disconnected portions of the black matrix."

According to claim 35, a conductive pattern and a pixel electrode are two different elements. In this regard, Matsumoto fails to disclose or suggest any element that is separated from the gate line and covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix. Thus, it is submitted that claim 35 is patentable from Matsumoto.

Similarly, independent claim 39 recites "forming a pixel electrode on the substrate; and forming a conductive pattern on the substrate, the conductive pattern being separated from the gate line and covering a gap between the disconnected

portions of the black matrix layer.” As mentioned above, Matsumoto fails to disclose or suggest any element that corresponds to the claimed conductive pattern. Thus, it is submitted that claim 39 is patentable from Matsumoto.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 35 and 39.

Claims 35-37 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,297,862 issued to Murade (“Murade”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claims 35-37, independent claim 35 has been amended to recite that the black matrix and the conductive pattern are formed on the same substrate. In this regard, the Examiner asserted that, in Murade, the black matrix 6 corresponds to the claimed conductive pattern. However, the black matrix 6 is formed on the upper substrate and the first light shielding film 7 is formed on the lower substrate. Since Murade fails to disclose or suggest the black matrix 6 and the first light shielding film 7 formed on the same substrate, it is submitted that claim 35 is patentable over Murade. Claims 36-37 are dependent from claim 35 and hence would also be patentable at least for the same reason.

Similarly, amended independent claim 39 recites forming the black matrix and the conductive pattern on the same substrate. Thus, it is submitted that claim 39 is also patentable from Murade. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 35-37 and 39.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,


Richard T. Schachner
Registration No. 48,342

Date: November 1, 2005

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5000
Fax: 703-712-5050
HCP/WSC/alj

\\COM\547090.1